

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 remains pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

Fig. 2 is objected to because of Fig. 2 is not labeled with full text. In response, Fig. 2 has been labeled with full text. Replacement Fig. 2 is submitted herewith and accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The abstract is objected to as noted in the Office Action. In response, the abstract has been amended and new clean version abstract is attached hereto. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

The disclosure is objected to because of the noted informalities. In response, the specification has been amended to add the section headings. In addition, the Examiner alleges that the acronyms "IP-S, L2P, L3P, FRW, TAD, IPZ, MTG, CDS, on page 5 and "MSG, LCC, GTW, MGW, TUN, IAD, MAG, ACS" on page 6, and "LOC, QSM" on page 7 should be spelled out in full text at least once in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the terms pointed out by the Examiner are not acronyms, but only the name given used by the Applicants as the lexicographer. A list of terms has nevertheless been added to overcome the objection for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the noted informalities. In response, claim 1 has been amended, for example, the terms of "ACS, LOC and QSM" have been deleted. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, claim 1 has been amended to be definite to particularly point out the subject matter, for example, "a block comprising one or more of the following elements" has been changed to "a block comprising at least one of". Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Amin et al., hereafter “Amin” (US 6714987 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by the reason discussed below. Although claim 1 was amended, it was not amended to overcome Amin.

Claim 1 recites “a system for dynamically controlling equipment in a communication system, taking into account the dynamics associated at least with mobility of user, said system comprising at least one control module comprising at least:

- a control block comprising:
 - a first control component for processing authentication of users connected to the network, dynamic configuration of IP addresses, management of authorizations for service requests from users, configuration of network components according to the authenticated users;
 - a second control component for the process of user affiliation, server mobility, user location and application-oriented service routing;
 - a third control component for processing service quality management on highways of the network;
- a block comprising at least one of a component for various user services, the network components, and a component for connectivity to external entities.

Applicants submit that the applied reference of Amin fails to disclose the claimed features above, because the claimed feature requires that all the users are mobile, whereas Amin appears to disclose a centralized structure, i.e., a static structure. Specifically, the local service function of Amin is included in the static architecture rather in the mobile user. In addition, the local service function layer of the static architecture disclosed by Amin comprises an access accounting server, an authentication, authorization, and accounting server, a security gateway, a policy enforcement server, a mobility manager, which are in the static architecture. On the contrary, claim 1 requires that all the elements and users are mobile. Accordingly, Amin as applied by the Examiner appears to disclose a centralized structure, i.e., a static architecture, with mobile users, whereas the claimed application requires a decentralized architecture, all claimed elements are mobile, and it is necessary for each mobile user to have all the

functions to communication in a mobile environment. For at least this reason, this rejection should be withdrawn and claim 1 should be allowable over the applied art.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 27, 2009
KMB/CHY/ser